Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

policy of the world. They lay the axe at the root of the great practical evil we are combatting.

The truth of this position is confirmed by the chief political movements of the day. Look at the struggles of Cobden and his associates in the Parliament of England to reduce her enormous expenses; at the vain or but partially successful attempts of Russia and Austria to negotiate loans for the support of their tottering despotisms by military force; or at the strong points which Kossuth, in his public speeches and appeals since his release from Turkey, has so adroitly put to the statesmen and patriots of both hemispheres. The principles avowed, and the measures reeommended by the associated friends of peace, are already seen by sagacious men to be the very levers that must in time move the entire fabric of the world's international policy. The sweep of their legitimate application is co-extensive with the intercourse of nations; and their moral, peaceful power will be found, when rightly applied, sufficient to subvert or neutralize the present war-system as a recognized arbiter of international justice.

THE TRUE REVOLUTION.

A just cause of complaint does not make war a just means of redress.—Peace Motto.

The advent of the great Hungarian to this country has opened a question of deep political interest, which, in the stir of party politics, has been hitherto much disregarded, and which is especially interesting to the friends of pence. He contemplates another revolution in Hungary, of which he will be the soul. He does not ask of the American Government, that it shall give military aid to such a revolution, but only that it shall exert its influence to prevent the Russian Emperor from again interfering to crush it; and he plainly leaves it to be understood, that, should Russia disregard a remonstrance on our part, we should enforce it by war. A large portion of our people, influenced by their own revolutionary feelings, sympathy for his oppressed countrymen, and the irresistible charm of his eloquence, are disposed to go with him the whole length of his requests; that the Government and the more conservative part of the nation do not yield to them, is merely because such a course would be in contravention of the revered advice of Washington, and the settled policy of the nation. Among the slaveholding portion of the Union, the Hungarian claim is rejected, because it is perceived, that every revolutionary triumph of liberty in the Old World reflects back a frowning reproach upon Cis-Atlantic bondage, and an encouragement to agitation which must endanger its existence.

The thorough friends of peace object to the proposals of Kossuth on higher and nobler groands. They mourn no less than others at the view of the dark cloud of despotism that overshadows the Eastern continent; they are second to none in ardent desire for the emancipation, the freedom and intellectual elevation of all the human race; but, in obedience to that martyr-

spirit of the Gospel, which enjoins resignation to oppression, rather than overthrow of it by destruction of the oppressor, and taught by that divine wisdom which is wiser than human, that evil can never be effectually overcome by evil, they withhold all countenance and aid from the most desired object, if it cannot be given but in disobedience to divine commands. The more just, the more holy, the more urgent the cause to which they are called to give martial assistance, the greater is the test of their integrity to Christian principles.

The advocates of peace have reason to rejoice, that the question for which they have been so long vainly endeavoring to gain the attention of the public, is now forced upon it by the event on which we comment. While both parties on this question hold to the right of revolution by war, those who are in favor of carrying out this principle by *enforcing* the non-intervention regulation solicited by Kossuth, are more consistent than those who oppose his desires on mere political grounds. If our revolution, and war to maintain it, were right, and if we were willing to receive foreign aid to achieve it; with what generosity or honor can we refuse such aid to a nation praying for it to throw off a severer oppression? Give the right to a nation to overthrow despotism by arms, and the right to another nation to aid in such overthrow; and the advice of Washington, and the alleged "settled policy" of the country appear in their true light, as the evasions of a mean and heartless selfishness. The only honorable excuse for declining to march with our hosts to battle by the side of those of Hungary, is to be found in Divine prohibition. Kossuth has virtually put the solemn question before the American people—whether, leaving their mere grandiloquent sympathy, they will give him the effective aid demanded by their professed principles; or, whether they will escape the obligation under the shield of Christianity? This question the friends of peace should make to ring in the ears of every citizen, whether armed with a musket or a vote. If ye are for the "Baal" of war, follow *him!* If ye are for the God of peace, then follow *him!*

Mournful, indeed, is the aspect of the world, crushed under the aggregated weight of tyranny, ignorance, superstition and vice; but let the Christian philanthropist, who would strike at these evils, pause before he takes up for the purpose the weapons his Saviour has forbidden. To the eyes from which the scales of martial delusion have been removed, God has given political manifestations in confirmation of the forbearing doctrines of his Son. He has everywhere rebuked the attempt to conquer evil by evil, to divide the kingdom of Satan against itself. Greece, Poland, Schleswick, Hungary, Algeria, India, Caffraria, the South American Republics, the red men of our Western forests, and even mighty, illuminated France, have successively failed in defending freedom by arms, and have gained only increased oppression and ruinous demoralization. Should the flame of revolution again be kindled in Europe, and the people triumph over inverted thrones and banished sovereigns, though the head of despotism should be hid in a republican mask, its muscular arms would be yet unpinioned. Amid the complex machinery of congresses and constitutions

legislative and popular assemblies, and contested suffrages, the bayonet of the soldier would still be the real ruler. The greatest victory ever achieved on earth over the "principalities" of tyranny, and "powers of darkness," was won by the patient fortitude, the unresisting disobedience of suffering martyrs. When the professed followers of Christ shall learn and practice these Christian tactics, then shall a peaceful revolution roll on, which shall pervade the earth, and dissolve all oppressive power in universal love.

J. P. B.

A BETTER WAY:

OR, PEACEFUL MEANS FOR SECURING NON-INTERVENTION.

It is strangely supposed by many, that no means short of war, or threat of war, can ever insure the general adoption of this principle. We cannot now examine the logic or the rhetoric employed to justify this assertion; but we insist, as we think it would be easy to show, that the doctrine of non-intervention, already a law alike of nature and of nations, can be wrought into their practice only by peaceful means, and that any use or menace of the sword would serve only to defeat or postpone such a result.

Reflect, for a moment, on the nature and probabilities of the case. Let the United States or Great Britain say to the despotic powers of Europe, 'You must henceforth abstain from all interference in the affairs of other countries, or we will draw the sword, and never sheathe it until this principle in the law of nations is fully and permanently established.' Would Russia heed such a demand or threat? No; it would touch her pride to the quick, and provoke her to fight for ages rather than recede one inch from her present position at the menace of any power on earth. Thus should we postpone the establishment of this great principle; for we should have to wait a long series of years before her insulted pride would stoop ever to consider the question; and, when she did, it would be, not under the terror of a threat, but solely as the result of some peaceful, conciliatory appeal to her reason or her interests. Let us rely from first to last on such appeals; and we shall succeed much sooner, as well as more surely, than we could by the sword. All governments, whether democratic or despotic, are *interested* in the doctrine of non-intervention; and, though it is now demanded mainly as a shield for infant liberty struggling against hoary despotism, the time may yet come, and that very soon, when Austria and Russia themselves will need it as a barrier against the whirlwind of democratic revolution sweeping with resistless force over all Europe. Despots know this, or can be made to see it; and, under the influence of arguments thus appealing alike to all parties, the principle of non-intervention might be peacefully established as a common right and interest.

Look at a single fact. England, roused by the friends of humanity in her borders, was induced not only to make it piracy for her own citizens to engage in the slave-trade, but to undertake in earnest the task of bringing the whole civilized world to treat it in the same way, and to unite with her for the entire, perpetual suppression of that infernal traffic. She succeeded; and how? Did she threaten war in a single case? Did she send her vast